

REMARKS

Claims 1, 24, 46 and 48 are amended herein to clarify the content of the claims in response to the points presented by the Examiner in the telephonic interview conducted on Tuesday, September 14, 2010. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added thereby. These amendments are supported, for example, by at least page 12, line 28 – page 13, line 13.

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-17, 19-48 and 50-57 remain pending in the application. Claims 2, 9, 18 and 49 were previously cancelled. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Telephonic Interview:

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended by the Examiner in the telephonic interview of Tuesday, September 14, 2010 between the Examiner and Applicants' representatives. In that interview, the Examiner expressed a favorable inclination to reconsider the claims in response to the submission of certain clarifying amendments to each of the independent claims that were not allowed in the Office Action of June 25, 2010.

In view of the points expressed by the Examiner in that interview, Applicants have prepared the above-included amendments to specifically clarify the features that the Examiner has indicated possess particular merit.

Applicants further herewith formally request an interview with respect to any issues identified by the Examiner as hindering allowance of the presented claims after the entry of the above-listed amendments.

Allowed Claims:

Applicant acknowledges that claims 42-45 have been allowed by the Examiner.

Claims Objected To But Otherwise Allowable:

Applicant acknowledges that claims 10, 11, 28, 29, 50 and 51 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Section 103(a) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 6-8, 13-17, 19-24, 27, 31-35, 37-41, 46-48 and 53-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ballantyne, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,687,873) (hereinafter “Ballantyne”) in view of Sahota, et al. (U.S. Publication 2005/0114757) (hereinafter “Sahota”), claims 3-5, 25, 26 and 36 as being unpatentable over Ballantyne in view of Sahota and further in view of Merrick et al. (U.S. Publication 2005/0166209) (hereinafter “Merrick”), claims 12, 30 and 52 as being unpatentable over Ballantyne in view of Sahota and further in view of Sravanapudi, et al. (U.S. Publication 2001/0049603) (hereinafter “Sravanapudi”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

A. The combination of Ballantyne and Sahota does not teach the recited “in response to the request, the service generating results data for the client ... the service providing a presentation schema to a data presentation process in the distributed computing environment.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ballantyne and Sahota does not teach or suggest each element of Applicants amended claims. The combination of Ballantyne and Sahota at least lacks and possibly teaches away from the features

recited with respect to Applicants' recited service. As amended, Applicants' claim 1 recites, in relevant part:

a service in the distributed computing environment receiving a request from a client in the distributed computing environment, wherein the client and the service execute on separate devices in the distributed computing environment;

in response to the request, the service generating results data for the client;

the service providing a presentation schema to a data presentation process in the distributed computing environment;

Claim 1, as amended. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ballantyne and Sahota does not teach or suggest "in response to the request, the service generating results data for the client ... the service providing a presentation schema to a data presentation process in the distributed computing environment." The Office Action identifies the XML schema of Ballantyne as teaching or suggesting the recited presentation schema. See Office Action of June 25, 2010, p.4. Reliance on Ballantyne's XML schema as the recited presentation schema clarifies that no teaching or suggestion of the recited *in response to the request, the service generating results data for the client* and *providing a presentation schema to a data presentation process* is possible.

Specifically, though Ballantyne does not appear to clearly state the origins of the XML schema, the XML schema 32 of Ballantyne is presented to mapping system 26 of code generation system 14. See Ballantyne, Fig. 1 and Col. 6, lines 48-65. The Office Action thus appears to rely on the inference that the operation of code generation system 14 of Ballantyne teaches or suggests the recited service *providing a presentation schema to a data presentation process*. Code generation system 14 of Ballantyne, however, does not generate any result data. Instead, code generation system 14 modifies legacy program applications 16 and thereby generates modified legacy program applications 18. If any generating of result data is performed in Ballantyne, the generating of result data is performed by a modified legacy application 18. Thus, Ballantyne may not be read to teach or suggest the recited service both *in response to the request generating results*

data for the client and providing a presentation schema to a data presentation process. No element of the combination of Ballantyne and Sahota can be read to perform both of these functions, as recited.

Sahota, likewise can not be read to remedy this shortcoming of Ballantyne. Rather than teaching a single service performing both *in response to the request generating results data for the client and providing a presentation schema to a data presentation process*, Sahota teaches that data presentation information and result data come from different sources. See Sahota, ¶[0008]. Further, Sahota teaches centralizing and retaining its capture templates and presenting a standardized stream of output, rather than *providing a presentation schema to a data presentation process*. Sahota also does not appear to prepare data in response to requests from clients. See Sahota, ¶[0008]. Thus, Sahota may not be read to teach or suggest the recited service *generating results data for the client in response to the request and providing a presentation schema to a data presentation process*.

In view of these differences in how data is handled, the paradigms of data access and presentation of Sahota and Ballantyne vary from each other to such a great degree that they appear to be uncombinable. The difference in paradigms of data access and presentation also appear to vary so widely between Sahota and the features recited in Applicants' claims that Sahota appears nearly to teach away from the features recited in Applicants' claims. Thus, the combination of Sahota and Ballantyne does not teach or suggest the recited *in response to the request the service generating results data for the client and providing a presentation schema to a data presentation process* and therefore does not teach or suggest all elements of Applicants' claim 1, as required.

B. The cited art does not teach the recited “the data presentation process accessing the presentation schema... the data presentation process presenting the results data.”

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the alleged combination of Sahota and Ballantyne does not teach or suggest the features recited with respect to Applicants’ data presentation process. As amended, Applicants’ claim 1 recites, in relevant part:

the data presentation process accessing the presentation schema in the distributed computing environment, wherein the presentation schema includes information for presenting results data for clients in the distributed computing environment, wherein the data presentation process and the service execute on separate devices in the distributed computing environment;

the data presentation process accessing the results data; and

the data presentation process presenting the results data for the client in accordance with the information from the presentation schema.

Claim 1, as amended. Applicants’ amended claim 1 recites *the data presentation process accessing the presentation schema and the data presentation process presenting the results data.* As discussed above, the Office Action identifies the XML schema of Ballantyne as teaching or suggesting the recited presentation schema. See Office Action of June 25, 2010, p.4. Reliance on Ballantyne’s XLM schema as the recited presentation schema clarifies that no teaching or suggestion of the recited data presentation process *accessing the presentation schema and presenting the results data* is possible. Only Ballantyne’s mapping engine 26 of code generation service 14 accesses the XML schema 32 of Ballantyne. See Ballantyne, Col. 6, lines 48-59. However, Ballantyne’s code generation service 14 does not output result data. Result data, as discussed above, is output only by Ballantyne’s modified legacy application 18, which does not access XML schema 26. See Ballantyne, FIG. 1 and Col. 7, lines 2-7. Thus, no element of Ballantyne teaches or suggests the recited limitation of a data presentation process both *accessing the presentation schema and presenting the results data for the client in accordance with the information from the presentation schema.*

Likewise, Sahota is not cited for this set of functions. See Office Action of June 25, 2010, p.4. One of skill in the art would not expect Sahota to teach or suggest *accessing the presentation schema* and *presenting the results data for the client in accordance with the information from the presentation schema*, because the Sahota centralizes and retains its capture templates, providing only a standardized data stream. For at least the reason that the combination of Ballantyne and Sahota does not teach or suggest a data presentation process both *accessing the presentation schema* and *presenting the results data for the client in accordance with the information from the presentation schema*, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ballantyne and Sahota not teach or suggest all of the limitations of Applicants' claim 1.

C. The cited art does not teach the recited “the data presentation process accessing the presentation schema.”

The Office Action has indicated that the *data presentation process accessing the results data* is taught at Col. 6 and Col. 7, lines 1-67 of Ballantyne. See Office Action of June 25, 2010, p.4. As discussed in the telephonic interview, Applicants have examined the cited text of Ballantyne and have found no teaching or suggestion of a *data presentation process accessing the results data*. The cited text of Ballantyne merely discusses that output data is written by a legacy application. The cited text of Ballantyne does not teach or suggest any entity accessing result data. The absence from Ballantyne of any reference to accessing result data is to be expected, as Ballantyne is almost exclusively concerned with modifying a legacy application to emit data in a required format. See Ballantyne, abstract. Nor is Sahota cited for this function. See Office Action of June 25, 2010, p.4. For at least the reason that Ballantyne does not teach or suggest the *data presentation process accessing the results data*, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ballantyne and Sahota do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of Applicants' claim 1.

D. The above-presented arguments are broadly applicable

As the Office Action has rejected independent claims 24, 46 and 48 on grounds similar to those asserted against independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 24, 46 and 48 are likewise allowable. Similarly, as each of dependent claims 3-8, 10-23, 25-41, and 50-57 depends from and further patentably distinguishes an allowable base claim, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the dependent claims is similarly allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-8, 24-41 and 48-57, as well an indication of the allowability of all pending claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-57700/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: September 27, 2010